

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated February 2, 2010 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Applicants note that receipt of the priority documents filed has not been acknowledged by the Office. In the telephone interview conducted on November 2, 2009, however, the Examiner agreed that the priority documents have been received by the Office. Applicants respectfully request that the Office acknowledge receipt of the priority documents as stated in the Interview Summary dated November 3, 2009.

Claims 1 and 9 are hereby amended. No new matter was added. Claim 5 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No claims are added. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 6-31 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**Claims 1-10 and 21-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,660,063 to Lee et al. (hereinafter “Lee”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,042,276 to Kamano et al. (hereinafter “Kamano”).** *Office Action* at p. 2, ¶ 1. The rejection of claim 5 is moot as claim 5 is canceled herein. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the remaining claims and request reconsideration.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over *Lee* in view of *Kamano* in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a filter case mounted at a front portion of the outer case to be exposed to an outside of the washing machine such that a user directly accesses the filter case, wherein the filter case pivots on a lower end thereof hinged on the outer case, toward the outside of the washing machine.” *Lee* does not teach or suggest, at least, these features of claim 1.

*Lee* discloses a filter 100 installed in a water-flowing path of a washing machine. *See Lee* at col. 5:47-49, lines 64-67 and Figs. 1 and 2. As shown, *Lee*’s filter 100 includes a cylindrical body 101, a mesh member 200, a locking lid 300, and an annular packing 400. *See Lee* at col. 6:4-6. The mesh member 200 is assembled in the body 101 using the locking lid 300. *See Lee* at col. 6:8-9. Further, the body 101 has a first tube 110 and a second tube 130 incorporated with the first tube 110,

and the mesh member 200 is actually inserted into the first tube 110. *See Lee* at col. 6:12-13 and lines 8-9.

The Office alleges that *Lee*'s first tube 110 reads on the "filter case" recited in the claim. *See Office Action* at p. 3, ¶ 2. The Office also asserts that "it appears that the filter case is mounted to be rotatable in *Lee* due to the circular shape of the casing." *Office Action* at p. 5. *Lee* discloses, however, that the body 101 including the first tube 110 is fixed to a housing 12. *Lee* at col. 9:34-38. That is, though the first tube 110 has a circular shape, the first tube 110 is unable to rotate due to the fixation to the housing 12. Therefore, *Lee* fails to teach or suggest "a filter case mounted at a front portion of the outer case to be exposed to an outside of the washing machine such that a user directly accesses the filter case, wherein the filter case pivots on a lower end thereof hinged on the outer case, toward the outside of the washing machine," as recited in claim 1.

*Kamano* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Lee*. Indeed, the Office only relied on *Kamano* to purportedly disclose "an overflow hole 20 for draining overflowing water." *Office Action* at p. 3, ¶ 3. Accordingly, none of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests "a filter case mounted at a front portion of the outer case to be exposed to an outside of the washing machine such that a user directly accesses the filter case, wherein the filter case pivots on a lower end thereof hinged on the outer case, toward the outside of the washing machine," as recited in independent claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 1. Claims 2-4, 6-10 and 21-31 depend from independent claim 1. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

**Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lee* in view *Kamano* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,645,732 to *Daniels* (hereinafter "*Daniels*").**  
*Office Action* at p. 7, ¶ 15.

*Daniels* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Lee* and *Kamano* with respect to independent claim 1. Indeed, the Office only relied upon *Daniels* to purportedly disclose "a mesh filter which includes a hinged ball." *Office Action* at p. 7. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in

combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of independent claim 1, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 11-12, which depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 11-12.

**Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lee* in view *Kamano* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,702,592 to *Suri* et al. (hereinafter “*Suri*”). *Office Action* at p. 7, ¶ 20.**

*Suri* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Lee* and *Kamano* with respect to independent claim 1. Indeed, the Office only relied upon *Suri* to purportedly disclose “a filter monitoring device.” *Office Action* at p. 8. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of independent claim 1, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 13-18, which depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 13-18.

**Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lee*, *Kamano* and *Suri* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,702,592 to *Choi* (hereinafter “*Choi*”). *Office Action* at p. 8, ¶ 24.**

*Choi* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Lee*, *Kamano* and *Suri* with respect to independent claim 1. Indeed, the Office only relied upon *Choi* to purportedly disclose “a door lock switch assembly comprising a switch case, a solenoid and a plunger.” *Office Action* at p. 9. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of independent claim 1, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 19-20, which depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 19-20.

## **CONCLUSION**

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps

necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: April 30, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Rosiland S. Rollins #60,164/ for  
Michael I. Angert  
Registration No.: 46,522  
McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Voice: 202-496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant